

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,628	07/13/2001	Dave Fornanek	IZE.01US01	3699

27479 7590 07/29/2004

COCHRAN FREUND & YOUNG LLC
3555 STANFORD ROAD
SUITE 230
FORT COLLINS, CO 80525

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/905,628	Applicant(s) FORMANEK ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed on 7/13/01.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 14, 20 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the "text blocks" within "said scaling of said *graphics blocks* is performed by adjusting the resolution of said *text blocks*" (lines 4-5) is a typographical error since said scaling of graphics blocks should be performed by an action on the graphics blocks, not on the text blocks. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:
Regarding claim 9, the "are" within "wherein said first scaling factor *are* selected by a user of said target device" (lines 1-2) is not correct. Appropriate correction is required.
Regarding claim 10, the "is" within "wherein said *first scaling factor* **and** said at least one additional scaling factor is selected by a user of said target device" (lines 1-2) is not correct. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 12-14, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rempell (US Pat No. 6,546,397 B1).

Regarding independent claim 1, Rempell discloses:

- generating an image file of said electronic document if said electronic document does not exist as an image file (figure 4b and figure 30: the web page is generated as an image file of an electronic file)

Art Unit: 2178

- generating reflowed document image positions for said word locations so that said text in said reflowed document image does not normally exceed said target display width (figure 30: the fact that the paragraphs width is converted into local screen values inherently shows that the paragraphs in the web page are scaled so that they are fitted in the screen of the target display; in other words, the paragraphs of the web page after scaled are reflowed and do not exceed the target display width)

Rempell does not explicitly disclose identifying graphics blocks and identifying word locations in said image file.

Instead, Rempell discloses that all the objects within the web pages can be scaled to the user's screen resolution and then to the current browser window size (col 2, lines 15-20, 43-50), where the objects such as the images and the paragraphs in the web page can be scaled to the local screen value (figure 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rempell to include identifying graphics blocks and word locations in the image file for the following reason. The fact that the images, equivalent to graphics blocks, and the paragraphs, which include the word locations, are scaled to the local screen values suggests that the images and the paragraphs be identified to be scaled to the width of the local screen.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rempell discloses:

- scaling graphics blocks that may exist in said image file so that said graphics do not exceed said target display width (figure 30: the fact that

Art Unit: 2178

the images are scaled by converting their widths and heights *to the local screen values where it is clear that the screen values includes the width value* inherently shows that the image sizes when scaled do not exceed the target display width)

- generating a reflowed document image position for said graphics (figure 30: the fact that the image width and height in the web page are converted into local screen values inherently shows that the web page is rearranged with the images scaled to be fitted in the screen of the target display; in other words, the images in the web page are reflowed after scaled for a reflowed document)

Regarding independent claim 3, Rempell discloses:

- generating an image file of said electronic document if said electronic document does not exist as an image file (figure 4b and figure 30: it is known that the web page is generated as an image file of an electronic file)
- generating reflowed document image positions for said word locations so that said text in said reflowed document image does not normally exceed said target display width (figure 30: the fact that the paragraphs width is converted into local screen values inherently shows that the web page is rearranged by the paragraphs scaled to be fitted in the screen of the target display; in other words, a reflowed document is generated with the scaled paragraphs from the web page that do not exceed the target display width)

Art Unit: 2178

- scaling graphics blocks that may exist in said image file so that said graphics do not exceed said target display width (figure 30: the fact that the images are scaled by converting their widths and heights *to the local screen values where it is clear that the screen values includes the width value* inherently shows that the image sizes when scaled do not exceed the target display width)
- generating a reflowed document image position for said graphics (figure 30: the fact that the image width and height in the web page are converted into local screen values inherently shows that the web page is rearranged with the images scaled to be fitted in the screen of the target display; in other words, the scaled images are reflowed for a reflowed web page)

Rempell does not explicitly disclose identifying graphics blocks and identifying word locations in said image file.

Instead, Rempell discloses that all the objects within the web pages can be scaled to the user's screen resolution and then to the current browser window size (col 2, lines 15-20, 43-50), where the objects such as the images and the paragraphs in the web page can be scaled to the local screen value (figure 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rempell to include identifying graphics blocks and word locations in the image file for the following reason. The fact that the images, equivalent to graphics blocks, and the paragraphs which include the word locations, are scaled to the local screen values suggests that the images and the paragraphs be identified to be scaled to the width of the local screen.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Rempell discloses scaling said text blocks so that said text appears on said target display having a predetermined size (figure 30: the paragraphs are scaled by converting the paragraph width *to the local screen values where each local screen, of course, has a predetermined size*).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Rempell discloses that scaling text blocks is performed by adjusting the resolution of said text blocks (col 2, lines 15-20, 43-50: the fact that all the objects of the web pages can be scaled to the user's screen resolution where the objects include images and paragraphs inherently shows that the paragraphs, equivalent to text blocks, be scaled by adjusting the resolutions of said text blocks to the resolution of the user's screen).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Rempell discloses that scaling text blocks is performed by adjusting the resolution of said text blocks (col 2, lines 15-20, 43-50: the fact that all the objects of the web pages can be scaled to the user's screen resolution where the objects include images and paragraphs (figure 30) inherently shows that the paragraphs, equivalent to text blocks, be scaled by adjusting the resolutions of said text blocks to the resolution of the user's screen). Rempell also discloses that scaling graphics blocks is performed by adjusting the resolution of said graphics blocks (col 2, lines 15-20, 43-50: the fact that all the objects of the web pages can be scaled to the user's screen

Art Unit: 2178

that the images be scaled by adjusting the resolutions of said image blocks to the resolution of the user's screen).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Rempell discloses that adjusting the resolution of said text blocks and said graphics blocks is performed using data reduction techniques (col 67, lines 45-67: the fact that the run time files include one compressed website specific and also include a dynamic web page scaling mechanism whereby each of said one or more generated web pages is scaled for viewing on the display shows that scaling or adjusting the display of data blocks is performed using the compression which is a data reduction technique).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, which are dependent on claims 3 and 6 respectively, Rempell discloses compressing said image file using image compression techniques (col 67, lines 45-67).

Claim 14 is the system of method claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 20 is the system of method claim 1 and 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

8. Claims 6, 9-11, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rempell as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Nolan (US Pat No. 5,754,873, 5/19/98, filed 6/1/95).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 3, Rempell discloses scaling all the objects of the web page including the text objects and graphics objects (col 2, lines 15-20, figure 30). However, Rempell does not disclose identifying text blocks having standard size text and non-standard text as well as scaling said text blocks having standard text using a first scaling factor and scaling said text blocks having non-standard text using at least one additional scaling factor.

Nolan discloses *scaling the text sections of a document selected by a user* where each text section can have a different displayed size by a scaling command so that the system will *calculate a scaling factor* for each preferred size entered by a user (col 2, lines 32-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Nolan to incorporate scaling the standard text and non-standard text of a document using a first scaling factor and at least one additional scaling factor for the following reason. The fact that Nolan has the capability of scaling different types of text using different scaling factors suggests the feature of scaling standard and non-standard text using different scaling factors since it is obvious that the standard text and non-standard text are basically different types of text having different sizes, and so, can be scaled by different scaling factors. Further, it was well known that a user can enter an

Art Unit: 2178

additional scaling factors e.g., 50%, 100%, 150%, etc. as an additional zoom on the scaled text section for a desired outcome.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Nolan into Rempell since Nolan teaches scaling different text of different sizes using different scaling factors plus it was known that a user can select an additional scaling factors for further scaling providing the advantage to incorporate into Rempell for scaling standard text as well as non-standard text using suitable scaling factors for a desired result.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Rempell discloses that a user at the target device enters a command for resizing the width of the selected text area (col 26, lines 22-59). Rempell does not disclose explicitly that said first scaling factor is selected by a user of said target device.

Nolan discloses that by entering a preferred size for a selected text section by a user, the system will calculate the corresponding scaling factor (col 2, lines 32-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Nolan into Rempell for the following reason. Providing a scaling factor based on the preferred size entered by a user in Nolan indirectly shows that the scaling factor is selected by said user via the entered size. This provides Rempell the advantage that a user can select a preferred scaling factor for scaling a selected text portion of standard size text.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Rempell discloses that a user at the target device enters a command for resizing the width of the selected text area (col 26, lines 22-59). Rempell does not disclose explicitly that said first scaling factor and said at least one additional scaling factor are selected by a user of said target device.

Nolan discloses that by entering a preferred size for a selected text section by a user, the system will calculate the corresponding scaling factor (col 2, lines 32-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Nolan into Rempell for the following reason. Providing a scaling factor based on the preferred size entered by a user in Nolan indirectly shows that the scaling factor is selected by said user via the entered size. Also, it was well known that a user can enter an additional scaling factors e.g., 50%, 100%, 150%, etc. as an additional zoom on the scaled text section. This provides Rempell the advantage that a user at a target device can scale a selected text portion of non-standard size text by selecting a scaling factor and at least one additional scaling factor for a desired outcome.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Rempell and Nolan do not disclose that said target device is a display device for users having low vision. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rempell and Nolan to include the feature that said target device is a display device for users having low vision for the following reason. Rempell and Nolan have the capability of resizing and

Art Unit: 2178

scaling the objects of a document at the target device as mentioned above. This suggests that Rempell and Nolan can be used by a user having low vision since said user to adjust the display of a document by scaling said display to a desired size suitable to his/her vision.

Claims 15-19 are for a system of method claims 6 and 9, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Makipaa et al. (US Pat No. 6,556,217 B1, 4/29/03, filed 6/1/00).

Halstead, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,667,750 B1, 12/23/03, filed 7/30/99).

Cooperman (US Pat No. 6,377,704 B1, 4/23/02, filed 4/30/98).

Mahoney et al. (US Pat No. 5,999,664, 12/7/99, filed 11/14/97).

Kaasila et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0137522, 7/24/03, filed 3/14/03, priority 5/2/01).

STOUB (US Pub No. 2001/0011364, 8/2/01, filed 1/7/98).

Lienhart et al. (US Pub No. 2002/0159636, 10/31/02, filed 3/14/00).

Badros et al., *A Constraint Extension to Scalable Vector Graphics*, ACM May 2001, pages 489-498.

Jerding et al., *The Information Mural : a Technique for Displaying a Navigating Large Information Spaces*, IEEE September 1998, pages 257-271.

Art Unit: 2178

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
7/23/04